

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the Replacement FIG. 4B filed with the April 21, 2005 *Amendment* is acceptable.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections and objections set forth in the January 21, 2005 *Office Action*.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-12 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 1-12 stand rejected.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The informality noted by the Examiner has been corrected. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claims 1-5 appear “to be directed merely to the manipulation of an abstract idea of evaluating the reflection performance of a reflecting mirror without resulting in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result” (*O.A.*, p. 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, 35 U.S.C. § 101 permits patents to be granted for “any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof.” In this regard, as independent claim 1 recites “[a] method of evaluating the reflection performance of a reflecting mirror,” which includes “entering design information” and “displaying attribute information,” it is clearly a process. Further, the displayed attribute

information (a non-limiting example of which is shown in FIG. 13, and discussed on pages 42 and 43 of the instant Application) clearly provides a useful and tangible result, as it (for example) provides a designer with an analysis of whether or not various reflecting basic surfaces adequately reflect light from the light source.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by “ReflectorCAD User’s Guide,” Breault Research Organization, 1999, pp. 1-87 (hereinafter “*BRO*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

BRO discloses a software program (see p. 16) in which a user may: (1) choose a base surface approximating the desired shape of the finished reflector (pp. 20-28; 56-58); (2) select a light source for use therein (pp. 26-27; 58); (3) create segments on the base surface which will form the actual reflector surface (pp. 28-31; 59-60); (4) direct each segment to illuminate a specific region of space (pp. 32-36; 60-62); (5) calculate the approximate output of the created segments (pp. 37-38; 62-63; 65-67); and (6) adjust the segments to minimize height discontinuities (pp. 41-43).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that *BRO* fails to teach or suggest independent claim 1’s “displaying attribute information concerning an attribute indicative of whether imaginary light from the light source position can effectively reach **each of a first plurality of areas into which a first reflecting basic surface, selected from among the plurality of reflecting basic surfaces, is divided**” (**emphasis added**).

Rather, the portion alleged by the Examiner to disclose these features (*i.e.*, the “output view, page 38, Figure 24”) only discloses: (1) an effective output of the reflector segment at a point distant from the reflector; and (2) the effective output of the reflector segment as a whole, as illustrated in Figure 16 (p. 33). Accordingly, this “output view” (or any other disclosed output in *BRO*) fails to provide any particular information regarding the reflector surface; let alone any particular information that indicates whether “each of a plurality of areas” of that surface effectively reflect light.

In fact, Applicant respectfully submits that, since *BRO* fails to teach or suggest any further division of its “segments,” it cannot reasonably be read as disclosing the provision of “a plurality of areas” within its disclosed segment. In this regard, *BRO* also cannot reasonably be read as teaching or suggesting any display of attributes related to such “a plurality of areas.”

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied reference.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that *BRO* fails to teach or suggest: (1) independent claim 6’s “first transmitting means for transmitting, to the display device, attribute information concerning an attribute indicative of whether imaginary light from the light source position can effectively reach each of a first plurality of areas into which a first reflecting basic surface, selected from among the reflecting basic surfaces, is divided;” and (2) independent claim 9’s “first display process for displaying attribute information concerning an attribute indicative of whether imaginary light from the light source position can effectively reach each of a first plurality of areas into which a first reflecting basic surface, selected from among the

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln No. 09/765,639

Docket No. Q62740

plurality of reflecting basic surfaces, is divided," for reasons similar to that discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that rejected dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8 and 10-12 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-12 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-12.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 20, 2005